Application No.: 10/551,805

Amendment Dated October 10, 2007 Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-6 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kosaki et al. and Javor et al. Claim 1 is amended to include,

... wherein the optimum directivity calculator includes:

a current position detector for detecting the current position of the mobile; and

a geographic data storage for storing **geographical** features which have respective height components in proximity to the current position of the mobile; and

the pattern for the directivity of the antenna is further calculated by a combination of the current position of the mobile and the stored geographical features. (Emphasis added).

Basis for these amendments may be found in the specification, for example, at page 11, line 25 to page 12, line 2 and Fig. 6.

Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a geographical storage 64 for saving a list of geographical features. (Page 11, line 25 to page 12, line 2 and Fig. 6). These geographical features include, for example, mountains and buildings "...which have respective height components..." The directivity calculator 61 supplies the antenna controller 13 with (1) geographical features "...which have respective height components," from the list of geographical features and (2) the current position data 64 of the mobile unit. Further, the supplied geographical features may be "...in proximity to the current position of the mobile..." Thus, "...the pattern for the directivity of the antenna is further calculated by a combination of the current position of the mobile and the stored geographical features in proximity to the current position of the mobile," as recited in claim 1.

Kosaki discloses a plurality of indicators for determining a signal disturbance. One of the indicators is a "geographical position" indicator which indicates a "...geographical position

Application No.: 10/551,805

Amendment Dated October 10, 2007 Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2007

where the mobile unit is present." (Col. 6, lines 55-65 and col. 13, lines 36-38). Kosaki further discloses a GPS antenna 7 and a GPS receiver 8. The GPS antenna 7 and a GPS receiver 8 are used to determine the latitude, longitude and height of the mobile. (Col. 13, lines 47-50). That is, Kosaki determines only the current position of the mobile. Kosaki does not disclose storing a list of geographical features, such as mountains and buildings, "...which have respective height components in proximity to the current position of the mobile..." Thus, Kosaki does not disclose "...the pattern for the directivity of the antenna is further calculated by a combination of the current position of the mobile and the stored geographical features," as recited in claim 1.

Javor et al. discloses a plurality of antennas 30 and 130. The antennas may have a radiation pattern that is omni-directional or in a fixed direction. (Para. [0020]). Thus, one antenna may be aligned in one direction and the other antenna may be aligned in a different direction. Javor et al. discloses that more than two antennas may be used for multiple receive paths. (Para. [0022]). However, Javor et al. does not disclose "...storing a list of geographical features, such as mountains and buildings, "...which have respective height components in proximity to the current position of the mobile..." Further, Javor et al. does not disclose "...the pattern for the directivity of the antenna is further calculated by a combination of the current position of the mobile and the stored geographical features in proximity to the current position of the mobile."

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6 are also allowable over the art of record.

Claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kosaki et al., Javor et al. and Toda et al. Claim 2 is allowable, however, because it depends from an allowable claim.

Application No.: 10/551,805

Amendment Dated October 10, 2007 Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2007

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

espectfully submitted

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515

Attorney for Applicants

LEA/DDF/dmw

Dated: October 10, 2007

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700

dmw174779